



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\$1711
#10
9/12/01
AS

In the Application of:

I-HWA LEE ET AL.

CASE NO.: AD-6430 US CIP

APPLICATION NO.: 09/494,107

GROUP ART UNIT: 1711

FILED: JANUARY 28, 2000

EXAMINER: J. MULLIS

FOR: ADHESIVE COMPOSITIONS BASED ON
BLENDS OF GRAFTED SUBSTANTIALLY
LINEAR POLYETHYLENES AND NON-GRAFTED
CONVENTIONAL POLYETHYLENES

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED
SEP 11 2001
TC 1700

RESPONSE

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed May 3, 2001, wherein Claims 1-21 were rejected, the Applicants request reconsideration of the claims in light of the following remarks.

REMARKS

Traversal of Rejections

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner states that the term "rapid" is relative and subjective, and therefore renders the claims unclear.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants contend that the specification is fully enlightening as to the meaning and the boundaries of the term "rapid" as used in the phrase "rapid film fabrication process" found in the claims. In the specification, at page 3, starting at line 11 and continuing to page 4 line 18, the Applicants go to great length to define the phrase "rapid film fabrication process", and describe what is meant thereby. One of ordinary skill in the art can easily discern the scope of the Applicants' claims from the description in the specification. The court has found